

a document purporting to be that application. This document is dated the 1st of March, 1937, but a cursory examination reveals its spuriousness. The address of the applicant is given as Stop 31, West Hill, Ontario, the date of birth as the 13th October, 1910, his height 5'8", and occupation merchant. The copy of the passport actually issued in 1937, which was left in the file, shows that the real Witczak was born on the 13th October, 1906, that his occupation was a farmer, and his height 5'9". This file copy of passport in its turn was interfered with by adding (but by the use of a different typewriter from that used when the document was made out in 1937) the name of Bunia Witczak as wife of the applicant with the following description: "profession, housewife; place and date of birth, Kurowo, Poland, March 29, 1914; domicile, Canada; height, 5'2"; colour of eyes, gray; colour of hair, brown".

Returning to the spurious application for passport, the same information with regard to the wife is found on it. As already mentioned, the real Witczak has been at all times an unmarried man. The voucher on the spurious application for passport is signed by John Soboloff, M.D., Toronto, Ontario, who therein declares that he has been acquainted with Ignacy Witczak for three years and believes that the statements made in the declaration are true and that he can from his personal knowledge of the applicant vouch him as a satisfactory and proper person to receive a passport.

Soboloff, who is a medical practitioner carrying on his profession at 583 Bathurst Street, Toronto, was called before us on the 5th of April, the same day on which Witczak gave his evidence. Soboloff admitted that he had not known Witczak nor the applicant for passport at any time and that he had signed the application in April or May of 1945 on the personal request of Sam Carr, who was a friend and patient of his and asked him to do so as a "favour". As he explained it, "he (Carr) was a patient of mine and a public figure and when he asked me to do it, without questioning it at all and without giving it any thought, I did so". He said Carr gave him to understand that it was a question of helping someone to leave the country or to get into the country, he was not sure which.

It is the practice in connection with applications for passports that two photographs of the applicant and two of the wife, if there is a wife to be included in the passport, should accompany the application, one photograph of each being certified by the voucher. The certified photographs remain with the application on file in the Passport Office while the uncertified photographs are attached to the issued passport. In the file in the Passport Office there is no photograph of the real Witczak, but there are photographs

of a man and a woman but neither is certified. The photograph of the man is not that of the real Witezak. Soboloff deposed that no photographs were shown to him when he signed at Carr's request. He also said that he observed when he signed the voucher on the application that the document was dated March 1937.

Under the system in force in the Passport Office for some years, an application for passport passes through a number of divisions and in its course the application is initialed by various employees. There are no initials at all on the application now produced from the Witezak file. Early in its progress through the Office an application receives a file number, and when the passport is issued the number of the passport as well as the file number are placed on a record opposite the name of the person to whom the passport is issued; and an index card is also kept under that name with file number. However, the index card for Witezak is missing, although the file as now produced is duly numbered 3699 of the year 1937; and the index for that year, which according to the usual practice was photographed at the end of that year, shows that originally there was an index card.

The records of the Passport Office also show that on the 30th August, 1945, a passport was issued to the spurious Ignacy Witezak, but although the file number is shown in the records as 2979-45, when that file is produced it is for another person altogether whose passport was regularly issued on the basis of documents duly entered in file numbered 2979-45. It is apparent that when this Witezak passport was issued it was done by some person in the Passport Office who attached the application to the other file and used it to pass the spurious document through the office.

The Passport Office is located at 38 Bank Street, Ottawa, but files more than three years old are kept in the basement of a church located some distance away, and a clerk in the Passport Office is charged with the duty of procuring files from storage from time to time as they may be required and of returning them. For this purpose she has a key of these other premises. This clerk, Mrs. Adrienne Souliere, entered upon her duties in or about the month of October, 1942, and on her own initiative began the keeping of a record of files taken out of and returned to the church. In this record she entered the file number and the name of the person requisitioning it, with the exception of those files requisitioned by a particular clerk in the Filing Section of the Passport Office who, because of her functions in dealing with correspondence, required files practically every day. While her name was not entered, the absence of any name indicated that such files had been given to this clerk.

This record was produced before us and shows that on the 14th of May, 1945, the Witczak file of 1937 numbered 3699-37 and another file in the name of three people by the name of Shepherd, No. 4019-37, were drawn by W. M. Pappin, a clerk in the Passport Office. The function of the section which he heads is, upon the receipt of applications for passports, to enter upon the back of the application the amount of the fee together with the medium in which payment is made. These payments and the names of the applicants are then entered upon cash sheets. It is Pappin's duty each day to sign these sheets. He does not do all this work personally and would not have personal knowledge of all the entries on the sheets he signs.

Investigation shows that so far as the real Witczak and the Shepherds are concerned, no reason had existed for reference to their file at any time since the date of the issue of their respective passports in 1937, except in the case of Mrs. Shepherd who in 1944 applied for a renewal of her passport.

The record kept by Mrs. Souliere shows further that on the 27th August, 1945, these two files, namely, 3699-37—Witczak and 4019-37—Shepherd, were again drawn from their place in the church, this time by the clerk in the Filing Section to whom we have already referred, who almost daily required a considerable number of files. It was on the 30th of August following that the passport to the spurious Witczak was issued. The fee for the issue of the passport was duly entered on the cash sheet for the 31st August and the sheet was signed by Pappin. The clerk referred to gave evidence before us, but has no recollection whatever of having asked for either of the above files although she must have done so. She says there is no reason she can think of why they would be required by her. The inference is that someone in the office used her to obtain the files for him.

Pappin gave evidence before us. He denied receiving either file on either the 14th of May or the 27th of August. He did not know there was any such record as that kept by Mrs. Souliere. On being shown it he nevertheless repeated his denial. Mrs. Souliere stated in evidence that she remembered handing both the files on May 14th, 1945, to Pappin. It is necessary for us to choose between the evidence of these two witnesses. We prefer the evidence of Mrs. Souliere supported as it is by the written record. When advised of Mrs. Souliere's testimony, Pappin did say that he had no reason to doubt her word, but he persisted in his denials.

On the 4th of April, 1946, a subpoena requiring Carr's attendance as a witness before us was served upon his wife, Julia Carr, as it was not possible to serve Carr personally. Subsequently, a further subpoena was served upon Carr by serving his wife, requiring his attendance before us on

April 15th, 1946, and a letter was written to Carr by the Secretary of the Commission advising him that his name appeared in records produced before us from the Russian Embassy and that it was desired to have his attendance so that he could be examined with regard to his activities and to make any explanation in person, or by counsel, that he desired. Carr did not appear and we have received no response to the above letter. According to Harris, Carr left for Cuba in January of 1946 and neither his wife, nor Harris, knows his address or when he is expected back. We have no difficulty in concluding on the evidence with regard to Carr's absence, that he has chosen to absent himself deliberately. With regard to this Harris testified:—

Q. And your conclusion from all that you have seen and read, and your talks with Mrs. Carr is that her husband is hiding some place and even she does not know where he is?

A. That is a question I would not ask her.

Q. But that is your conclusion?

A. Yes.

Carr himself applied for naturalization in Canada before 1937, and in March, 1945, and a certificate of naturalization was issued to him dated the 2nd of that month. He immediately applied for a Canadian passport and the records of the Passport Office contain a receipt signed by him for a passport issued to him over the counter of the Office on the 3rd day of March, 1945. According to the application for this passport, Carr's name at birth was Samuel Kogan, and it states that he was born in Kharkov, Russia, on the 7th of July, 1906.

That the Embassy records produced by Gouzenko deal with actual events has, as we have from time to time pointed out, been substantiated in many ways and by a number of witnesses. These records, of course, were never intended for the eye of any person outside the staff of the Military Attaché in the Russian Embassy and their superiors in Moscow. They are contemporaneous records made at the time by the directors of these activities as the events actually occurred. The truth of these records with regard to the participation of Carr in this passport matter is established by the evidence of Soboloff and, further, by Carr's own flight and concealment.

The accuracy of the records with regard to Carr is established.

As for Harris, he denied any participation in these activities. The evidence of Harris himself shows that he and Carr were intimates, seeing each other continuously in their respective offices or residences. They were also of the same ideology.

In Carr's dossier Motinov reports a meeting held in Ottawa on the 16th December, 1944, between himself, Carr and Harris in connection with passports. The records of a local hotel show that on that date Carr and Harris shared the same room, having arrived in Ottawa on the 16th and departed on the 17th of December, 1944. Harris admitted his handwriting on the hotel registration card and the facts it evidenced.

In the same dossier an entry by Rogov dated May 7th, 1945, indicates that Motinov (*Lamont*) handed over his contact with Harris (*The Doctor*) to Rogov (*Brent*) in Toronto. The records of one of the hotels in Toronto show that on 8th May, 1945, Rogov and Motinov had registered there.

It is also established that Harris was in Ottawa on June 16th, 1945, the date of the "regular meeting" described in the notes set out above, which took place on that date where "*The Doctor reported no success with the passport because of the absence of authentic data.*"

These notes contain a further entry under date "1.8.45" that "*the regular meeting took place. Everything was normal. The Doctor was at the meeting.*" This was in Montreal at "*the corner of Sherbrooke and Guy near the Medical Arts Bldg.*" We were not in possession of any evidence showing Harris' registration in any Montreal Hotel on that date, but he himself admitted being in Montreal in July or August. He was vague about this, as about most other things where independent evidence was lacking. We think this stay in Montreal in "*July or August*" 1945 embraced the date mentioned in the notes.

Harris' explanation of his visits to Ottawa and Montreal were that he came from Toronto to rest.

From all the evidence, regarded from the point of view of *The Official Secrets Act*, 1945, we are of opinion that Harris did what Rogov and Motinov said he did.

He stated that, although he had written to Carr more than once since the latter's departure for Cuba in January last and had received two or three letters from him, he had destroyed these and could not remember the address to which he had sent his letters although his last letter to Carr was within a month of his appearance before us. [Harris also told us that, notwithstanding his intimacy with Carr, he never discussed politics with him. We think this too great a strain on the credulity of any ordinary person. He said also that he had known [Tim Buck] for almost as long as he had known Carr and saw him frequently. But, according to Harris, although he and Buck visit each other's houses back and forth, and while the latter had been in Harris' office within a month of Harris' appearance before us,

they had never discussed Carr's absence nor this investigation. We think this evidence is of the same order as the above. There were other unsatisfactory features of Harris' evidence which we do not mention in detail, but upon which also we have based our conclusion as above.

Before parting with this subject we think it of interest to point out that in a book which appeared in 1939 written by W. G. Krivitsky, former Chief of the Soviet Military Intelligence in Western Europe, entitled *In Stalin's Secret Service*, the author describes the high value placed upon Canadian and American passports by the Soviet authorities from the standpoint of the use to be made of them by Russian agents in foreign countries parading as their true owners. On pages 56 and 57 the author refers to a conversation between himself and a Soviet official named Piatnitsky, as follows:—

I am reminded in this connection of a conversation I had with Piatnitsky. He had a man working for him named Lobonovsky, whose incompetence was always the subject of anecdotes in our circle. I would often run into Lobonovsky in one of the capitals of Europe as he scurried about on seemingly important missions. Later I had occasion to discuss him with Piatnitsky, "Tell me frankly, Comrade Piatnitsky," I said, "why do you keep that idiot on your staff?" The veteran Bolshevik leader smiled tolerantly and replied: "My dear young Walter, the question here is not Lobonovsky's capability. What is important is that he has a Canadian passport and I need a Canadian for the missions on which I send him. No one else will do." "Canadian!" I exclaimed, "Lobonovsky isn't a Canadian. He's a Ukrainian born in Shepetovka." Piatnitsky bellowed. "What do you mean, a Ukrainian born in Shepetovka! He has a Canadian passport. That's good enough for me. Do you think it's so easy to find a real Canadian? We've got to make the best of a Canadian born in Shepetovka!"

At page 95 the author indicates that what happened in the case of the passports held by the real Witczak was a well settled practice. He says:—

All the volunteers' passports were taken up when they arrived in Spain, and very rarely was a passport returned. Even when a man was discharged, he was told that his passport had been lost. From the

United States alone about 2000 volunteers came over, and genuine American passports are highly prized at OGPU headquarters in Moscow. Nearly every diplomatic pouch from Spain that arrived at the Lubyanka contained a batch of passports from members of the International Brigade.

Several times while I was in Moscow in the spring of 1937, I saw this mail in the offices of the Foreign Division of the OGPU. One day a batch of about a hundred passports arrived; half of them were American. They had belonged to dead soldiers. That was a great haul, a cause for celebration. The passports of the dead, after some weeks of inquiry into the family histories of their original owners, are easily adapted to their new bearers, the OGPU agents.

Another passage from page 57 is highly illuminative:—

Practically all matters regarding the manufacture and doctoring of passports and other documents are entrusted to native Russians. Pre-war conditions in Czarist Russia gave them exceptional training in this art. The elaborate passport regulations which have become prevalent in most European countries since 1918 found the Bolsheviks well prepared. In the offices of the OGPU and the Fourth Department of the Red Army there are experts who can forge consular signatures and government seals wholly indistinguishable from the genuine article.

In the present instance this technique has been extended into Canada and has reared its head in the Canadian Passport Office in Ottawa.

In concluding this Section of our Report, it should be stated that on the evidence before us, there would appear to have been only four male members of the Passport Office, who, as a practical matter, could have obtained the issue of the false passport. Of these four, the evidence which we have discussed above connects only one, W. M. Pappin, with the matter.

SECTION VI

AF 603,477

GERMINA (HERMINA) RABINOWITCH,**Geneva and Montreal.**

This person was for many years associated with the International Labour Organization, an international body set up, after World War I, in pursuance of Article 23 (a) of the Covenant of the League of Nations. A special Part of the Peace Treaties was devoted to Labour, establishment of the permanent International Labour Organization, consisting of a General Conference of Representatives of the members and an International Labour Office controlled by a Governing Body and a Director.

The principal functions of the International Labour Office, in addition to those assigned to it by the Conference, are: (1) the collection and distribution of information relating to industrial life and labour; (2) the examination of subjects proposed by the Conference; (3) the publication of a periodical paper; (4) the receipt of annual reports to give effect to the conventions to which they are party; (5) duties in connection with complaints. (*Oppenheim, International Law, Volume I page 575*).

Customary International Law confers certain immunities and privileges upon diplomatic persons. Members of the I.L.O. are given by treaty similar status. As such, Miss Rabinowitch was the holder of a Canadian diplomatic card bearing No. A-45, exempting her from the provisions of the National Registration Regulations.

As soon as we were notified that the proper authorities had, in her case, waived such immunities and privileges, Germina Rabinowitch was summoned and appeared before us on the 20th and on the 21st of May, 1946, accompanied by Counsel.

Born in Kaunas, Lithuania, on the 5th October, 1901, she was educated in Moscow, Paris, Geneva and Heidelberg. She holds the degree Ph.D. in Economics and Social Science. She speaks Russian, English, French, Italian and German.

She joined the International Labour Organization at its headquarters in Geneva in 1929, and arrived on this continent, travelling from Lisbon to New York, on a Greek boat, in the early days of September, 1940, to work in the headquarters of the I.L.O. then temporarily transferred to Montreal.

With the exception of several trips to the United States, she always remained in Montreal where she had in fact permanent residence at 539

Pine Avenue, West. The office of the I.L.O. was at 3480 University Street, Montreal.

Most of her relatives are in Europe, but a few are in the United States of America. She had a mailing address care of Leonard Carleton, New York, who is a son-in-law of one Kulischer, a former member of the Russian Economic Institute. She keeps funds in a bank in New York.

As soon as she arrived in the United States she applied there for citizenship; she said that her case is presently under advisement. Her intentions, she said, are to go to the United States and seek employment with the United Nations Organization if and as soon as United States citizenship is granted to her.

Amongst the Russian documents there are five which deal with her.

1. Four pages written in Russian by Motinov headed "*Germina*" and with the marginal note "*History*" and ending "*I await instructions about next meeting also money*" and the addresses and telephone numbers of Rabinowitch.
2. A typewritten letter in English addressed "*Dear Hermina*" and signed "*Gisel*", with an inscription in Russian on the back of it in the handwriting of Motinov.
3. A Report in Russian of an interview between *Leon* (Koudriavtzev) and *Hermina* (Germina Rabinowitch) on the 5th of May, 1944, ending as follows:—"I request your further directives 6.5.44. *Lamont*" (i.e. Motinov). (1st sec)
4. A Report in Russian of other meetings between *Leon* and *Hermina* and task assigned to her.
5. A typewritten letter in English dated August 18th, 1944, and signed "*Germina Rabinowitch*".

Some of the information contained in one of these documents was published in the press in the course of the trial of Mazerall in Ottawa. It was evident during the early part of her testimony that she had come prepared to tell a certain story based on her assumption that what she had thus read comprised all the information with regard to her in the possession of the Commission. When faced with all the documents she became embarrassed and stood mute. She was then asked whether she wanted to consult with her Counsel, who was present throughout her examination, to decide her line of conduct. Both of them withdrew, and after a short recess she changed her story and reluctantly admitted the substance of the documents and furnished many details which they did not mention.

The first of the documents above mentioned relates the history of the phase of Soviet operations involving Germina Rabinowitch and others:—

Hermina

R.H.—513 Grosvenor WA-Inut	3383
R.H.—6050 Darlington AT-lantic	3724
R.H.—4906 Queen Mary Rd. AT-	9148

14.4.44 Davie rang her up on these telephones but she was not there.

History. In December 1943 she rang up Tounkin and asked to be received on an urgent matter. T. refused, but afterwards received her. She outlined to him the gist of the matter. Tounkin inquired, but what she replied to him is not known. After that she wrote him a letter in which she wrote (9.3.44) that she had received through a reliable channel a letter from a friend in Geneva and attached it. The contents of the attached letter:

"We live in the former apartment and are working as previously in the old firm. Some two weeks ago Sisi sent you a telegram. Tell us how did your journey to Gisel's parents turn out. My health is excellent. Albert is sick and will probably leave his profession for a long time, he is laid up in bed. Relations with Lucy are good, she is a very good woman. Gisel's family is for some reason no longer interested in her, although up to this time there was support. Lucy's situation has improved. Sisi's position is sad. Please inform Gisel's parents that they must remit 6,700 dollars. This sum must be handed over through you. There are no other possibilities. The Gisels must bear these expenses. Advise me about Aleksander where is he". Rachel.

After this Pavlov, 2nd Secr. neighbour, asked his boss who, according to Pavlov, allegedly replied that this is their man and you (Pavlov) should do nothing. At the same time he asked Pavlov for her address, which he did not and does not know. To Lamont's question why they did not inform us about this for so long, Pavlov replied, I had these instructions to do nothing. Not having received a reply to the letter and the inquiries by telephone 13 April, that is on the

day of Davie's journey to Hermina's city, the latter wrote a second letter to Tounkin with a request to take measures in the matter of her first letter and for convincing she attached to this letter a second letter from Rachel of the following contents:—

"I have received your (Hermina's) telegram of 23.1.44. Please inform Gisel's family, that she should advise Znamensky 19, that Sisi is alive and works as of old with Lucy. Lucy wanted to change the personnel, but funds ran out. Albert is sick and is not interested in business. For the work of Sisi, Gisel's family must transfer 10,000 dollars. The transfer must be made by Hermina personally through N.Y. in connection with the wishes of Mr. Helmar". R.D.

Only after receiving this letter 15.4.44 did Pavlov 17.4.44 advise Lamont that there is a certain Rabino-
vich. After receiving these data on 19.4 we decided to contact her by telephone, as the latter was on her letterhead and to warn her that she must not write, nor ring up, and that in two weeks Gisel's man will visit her. She was very satisfied 19. This was carried out by Leon as Davie was in Vancouver. We consider that if there is to be a transfer of money, then the money must be transferred Washington and hand it over to Hermina in New York, as it is dangerous to cross the border with such a sum. For one thing our banks are not releasing American dollars.

The letters with copies of Rachel's letters have been sent by mail by Hermina and in all probability passed through the censorship, although there was no censor's stamp. The copy of the second letter, which deals with Znamensky 19, was particularly prejudicial.

Please appoint a man for future procedure, bearing in mind that Davie will not be able to go to New York and Washington. I await instructions about the next meeting, also money. We have *

Home telephone—Lancaster 76.28

Business—Plateau 25 07

Address. Apt. 539 Pine Av. not far from University St. (2 weeks from 19.4)

* Faint type indicates words crossed out in original documents.

The following facts are revealed by this document and the evidence.

In December, 1943, Rabinowitch, complying with instructions both cabled and written to her by Rachel D_____ (Sisi), a Soviet agent in Geneva and one connected with the I L O, proceeded from Montreal to the Soviet Embassy in Ottawa seeking to obtain several thousands of dollars for a group of Soviet agents operating in Europe.

After some difficulties she obtained an interview with the Counsellor of the Embassy, Tounkin. She said in her evidence:—

Q. Then would you please follow the Russian document, the original brought from the Embassy, and I will read the translation to you. If you find occasion to correct it, please do not hesitate to say so.

'In December 1943 she rang up Tounkin and asked to be received on an urgent matter'

Is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. You did phone Tounkin and asked to be received on an urgent matter?

A. That must have been before I went there.

Q. That was in December, 1943?

A. Yes.

Q. This is the history they give in the Russian Embassy?

A. Yes.

Q. 'Tounkin refused, but afterwards received her.' Is that right?

A. Yes.

Germina Rabinowitch then explained to him her mission, but much to her surprise and disappointment had no success, and so reported to Rachel D_____ by letter. She also cabled on the 23rd January, 1944. Her evidence is —

Q. What took place at the Embassy there?

A. I saw this man there, and we were not very friendly received at all.

Q. For whom did you ask when you arrived at the Embassy?

A. I asked for the Chargé d'Affaires.

Q. You asked for the Chargé d'Affaires?

A. Yes.

Q. And you were introduced to—

A. I don't know whom. I don't know whether he was the Charge d'Affaires.

- Q. Did he have on a military uniform or was he dressed in civilian clothes?
- A. Civilian clothes.
- Q. And what language did you employ?
- A. Well, I speak Russian, so it was either Russian or English; I don't know.
- Q. You speak Russian?
- A. Yes. We spoke Russian at home. And I discussed with him also I.L.O. matters. I asked him what publications he received, because we were interested to receive newspapers from Russia, for the office work. It was a very unpleasant interview, and I was rather furious and went away, and that was the end of it.
- Q. All right. You explained to us what took place as far as the I.L.O. situation was concerned, but would you give us the conversation you had with the gentleman as far as the request was concerned?
- A. I showed him the cable.
- Q. You showed him the cable?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Have you still got the cable?
- A. No, sir.
- Q. What happened to it?
- A. He did not quite understand, and it was—
- Q. I say, what happened to it, to the cable?
- Q. Where is the cable?
- A. I don't know. I must have thrown it away.
- Q. All right. Go ahead.
- A. He didn't know who these people were, and we dropped it. I saw that he didn't know what it was about, and I dropped the conversation. The whole interview lasted perhaps five or ten minutes, because when I saw that he was not prepared to speak with me, I left and went back to Montreal.
- Q. And did you tell your cousin in Geneva the result of the interview you had with the Chargé d'Affaires, or with any other person at the Embassy here?
- A. As far as I remember I must have written to him that the interview was unpleasant, and I didn't think that any kind of result would come out of it. I must have written to him.

She later received from Rachel D_____ a letter which, as requested by the latter, she sent to the Soviet Embassy on the 9th of March, 1944:—

Q. And what was in the letter?

A. The letter—it was a letter to me, which I received in the office, and in the envelope was another note which he asked me to forward to the Embassy. That note was not very clear to me, the contents, and I must say that I probably was rather careless in doing what I did.

Q. What did you do?

A. Because I put it in an envelope and wrote a few words and sent it to the Embassy here.

The letter, recited in the above document, is as follows —

We live in the former apartment and are working as previously in the old firm. Some two weeks ago Sisi sent you a telegram. Tell us how did your journey to Gisel's parents turn out. My health is excellent. Albert is sick and will probably leave his profession for a long time, he is laid up in bed. Relations with Lucy are good, she is a very good woman. Gisel's family is for some reason no longer interested in her, although up to this time there was support. Lucy's situation has improved. Sisi's position is sad. Please inform Gisel's parents that they must remit 6,700 dollars. This sum must be handed over through you. There are no other possibilities. The Gisel's must bear these expenses. Advise me about Aleksander where is he.

Rachel.

At one stage of her examination about the various names mentioned in that letter she testified as follows:—

Q. You say that you did not understand as to who these people were?

A. I did not know who they were."

Later, however, she identified *Aleksander* and *Paul*, and stated that *Gisel* is a man in the Soviet Embassy, most likely from Moscow. We know from Gouzenko that *Gisel* is a cover name for the Red Army Intelligence Service.

On being questioned again on this point at another stage of her examination she said:—

Q. If we go back to Exhibit 39†, in addition to the context of the letter which you said you remembered having received, on page 2 I see:

'I received your telegram of 23.1.44. Please inform Gisel's family. . .'

You are asked to inform the Soviet in Ottawa, is that not it? That is the Gisel family?

A. Yes.

Q. That is it, is it not? I am reading from Exhibit 39:

'I received your telegram of January 23, 1944.'

That is the telegram which you had sent. Do you remember that?

A. Yes.

Q. It goes on

'Please inform Gisel's family. . .'

Gisel's family, that is the Soviet Embassy people here, is it not?

A. Yes.

Gouzenko also said that *Lucy* is a very active agent in Geneva and he added that *Sisi* is quite a famous agent in Geneva.

As to the substance of that letter Rabinowitch testified—

Q. And he asked you to deliver that to the Russian Embassy here?

A. Yes. It was in the same business, the same aim, to obtain help, financial help to that person.

Q. And was an amount of money mentioned, as a matter of fact?

A. Yes, there was an amount mentioned.

Q. Which was what?

A. Which was quite high; which astonished me somehow.

Q. What was the amount?

A. I saw the papers here, so what I say now is what I read in the *Star* and the *Gazette*. The papers said it was \$10,000. I could not guarantee that that was the amount mentioned in the letter.

The interest of the Soviet Embassy and the use to be made of that money requested from the Soviet Embassy is very clearly shown in the following excerpt from the evidence of Miss Rabinowitch —

Q. Why would the Russians have an interest in Rachel?

A. Because she probably was working for them. That I could quite understand now.

Q. She was?

A. I do not know what she did.

†Quoted above, p. 568.

Q. You had the idea that Sisi was working for the Russians at the time since she could apply to the Russians for money to help her?

A. Yes.

The cautious attitude of the Soviet officials at Ottawa towards Miss Rabinowitch was not modified by the communication she made to them of that first letter from abroad however, the matter was, according to the Russian document, turned over to Pavlov, whom Motinov further identifies by his official position in the Embassy, "2nd Secretary", and then by the use of the word *Neighbour*, the cover-name for the N.K.V.D.

Pavlov communicated with Moscow on the matter and requested instructions. He was eventually "*directed to do nothing*" because Moscow considered "*that this is their person*".

Sisi wrote again to Rabinowitch and her letter is also recited in the above document, as follows:—

I have received your (Hermine's) telegram of 23.1.44. Please inform Gisel's family, that she should advise Znamensky 19. that Sisi is alive and works as of old with Lucy. Lucy wanted to change the personnel, but funds ran out. Albert is sick and is not interested in business. For the work of Sisi, Gisel's family must transfer 10,000 dollars. The transfer must be made by Hermine personally through N.Y. in connection with the wishes of Mr. Helmar.

R.D.

Following its receipt Rabinowitch telephoned to Tounkin on the 13th April, 1944, and also wrote him a letter received at the Embassy on the 15th April requesting him to take action and, in order to convince of the genuine and urgent character of the request, she enclosed the letter.

The following extracts from the evidence of Rabinowitch relate to the Russian document:—

Q. But if the document says you wrote a second letter, you are not in a position to deny what the document says?

A. No.

Q. I continue reading.

'. . . a second letter to Tounkin, with a request to take measures about her first letter and for convincing attaches to this letter a second letter from Rachel of the following context.'

This is the letter that it is said in the document you received from Rachel, and which you attached to the second letter you wrote to Tounkin.

'I received your telegram. . . .'

That is, Rachel says she has received a telegram.

' . . . of 23.1.44. Please inform Gisel's family that she advise Znamensky 19 that Sisi lives and works as of old with Lucy. Lucy wished to change the personnel but finances came to an end. Albert is sick and is not interested in business. For the work of Sisi, Gisel's family must transfer 10,000 dollars. Hermann must make the transfer personally through N.Y. in connection with the wishes of Mister Helmars.'

Then there are the initials, this is 'P' in Russian, which is 'R' in English?

A. Yes.

Q. And the initials "R.D." would stand for Rachel D. _____
Is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. All right. Do you remember having read the context of that letter, which the document says you transmitted to them?

A. I don't remember the fact of two letters. It is driving me completely crazy, but I cannot remember that. I was telling Mr. Charlap (*Counsel for the Witness*) the whole time I was thinking about that, for the two hours, and I can't just remember there were two letters.

Q. Is it not in this letter that you found that \$10,000 that you were speaking about this morning?

A. Maybe it was this letter I only remember receiving. They are very similar.

Q. I suppose if you had taken notes like Motinov did you would not have to worry about recalling things?

A. No.

Q. But the document is there, and you are not in a position to deny what it says?

A. I am not in a position to deny, but I have my doubts.

Q. All right. Then Motinov goes on to say:

'Only after receiving this letter 15.4.44 Pavlov 17.4.44 advised Lamont that there is a certain Rabinowitch. After receiving these data on 19 4 we decided to contact her by telephone, as

the letter was on her letter form and to warn her that she must not write nor ring up and that in two weeks Gisel's man will visit her. 19. This was established by Leon as Davie was in Vancouver. We consider that if there is to be money handed over the money must be transferred by Washington and hand it over to Hermia in New York as it is dangerous to cross the border with such a sum. For one thing, our banks are not releasing American dollars.

The letters with copies of Rachel's letters have been sent by mail and in all probability passed through the censor although there is no censor's stamp. The two copies of the letters where the subject touches Znamensky 19 are specially harmful. Please appoint a man for future procedure bearing in mind that Davie cannot go to New York and Washington. I await instructions about next meeting also money.

Home telephone—Lancaster 7628

Business telephone—Plateau 2507

*Address—Apartment 539 Pine Avenue,
not far from University Street.*

Then a date is fixed for the meeting. Two weeks from April 19 the meeting was to take place with you in Montreal. What do you say as to that?

- A. It is a fantastic story, completely.
- Q. It is not fantastic. It is your own address, is it not, your own telephone number?
- A. I gave my address on the letter I wrote to them.
- Q. What is fantastic about it?
- A. This story about all these people visiting me.
- Q. There is nothing fantastic about it. They are only following your telephone conversation, that you have admitted with them, your visit, that you have admitted to them. Then the fact that nothing was coming through, that you had not got the reception that was expected, and that to convince them you have admitted that you sent them a letter that you had received from Switzerland. That was not fantastic. You admitted that, and that is only the sequence of that, is it not? There is nothing fantastic. The sequence is there?
- A. But why didn't I remember the second letter, and I don't remember

Later in her evidence she admitted that letter and the facts connected thereto as related in the document.

So far as the Soviet officials in Ottawa are concerned, they were definitely disturbed by this second letter from Montreal sent to them through ordinary mail by Rabinowitch, and Motinov wrote with regard to this the following comments:—

The letters with copies of Rachel's letters have been sent by mail by Hermina and in all probability passed through the censorship, although there was no censor's stamp. The copy of the second letter, which deals with Znamensky 19, was particularly prejudicial.

There was evidently some discussion on the matter and a conflict of jurisdiction seems to have arisen for the Russian document says:

Only after receiving this letter 15.4.44 did Pavlov 17.4.44 advise LAMONT (Motinov) that there is a certain Rabinowitch. . . . To LAMONT'S question why they did not inform us/about this for so long, Pavlov replied, I had these instructions to do nothing.

"Znamensky 19" is the street address in Moscow of the Red Army Intelligence Headquarters, which made it unmistakably clear to Pavlov that Rabinowitch could not be used by his N.K.V.D. network. Zaborin's Organization, however, without referring the matter to Moscow, thought it to be so urgent that as Motinov puts it in the Russian document —

Rabinovich. After receiving these data on 19.4 we decided to contact her by telephone, as the latter was on her letterhead and to warn her that she must not write, nor ring up, and that in two weeks Gisel's man will visit her.

It was then that Sokolov (*Daria*) tried to contact "that certain Rabinowitch" with the assistance of the Montreal Telephone Directory, as shown by the document. On this point the witness said —

Q. Then it refers to 513 GROSVENOR, WALNUT 3383, then to 6050 DARTINGTON, ATLANTIC 3727 and then to 4906 QUEEN MARY ROAD, ATLANTIC 9148. None of these was your address?

A. No, sir.

Q. But if we look in the Montreal Telephone Directory, the edition of 1943, which will be filed as Exhibit 559, all these addresses and

* Faint type indicates word crossed out in original documents.

telephone numbers are referred to on page 397. H RABINOWITCH,
513 GROSVENOR?

A. Yes.

Q. WALNUT 3383?

A. Yes.

Q. Which is the first name and number mentioned in the Russian document?

A. Yes.

Q. Then H. RABINOWITCH, 6050 DARLINGTON?

A. Yes.

Q. ATLANTIC 3727?

A. Yes.

Q. Which is the second name mentioned in the Russian document?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And then Mrs. H. RABINOWITCH, 4906 QUEEN MARY ROAD,
ATLANTIC 9148?

A. Yes.

Q. Which is the third name mentioned in the Russian document?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you notice that these names and telephone numbers and addresses mentioned in the Russian document are mentioned in exactly the same order in the Montreal Telephone Directory for the year 1943, which has been filed as Exhibit 559?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. So that would suggest that they were at that time trying to find out who that Hermina or H. Rabinowitch was?

A. Yes.

Q. That is clear, is it not?

A. Yes.

Q. Then this document goes on:

Davy rang her up on these telephones but she was not there.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. There was a good reason why you could not be found there, the main one being that that was not your residence, that none of these numbers was your residence?

A. No.

Q. Is that right?

A. That is right.

- Q *Datie* was apparently looking for you through the telephone directory. Would you say that was right?
- A I guess so. Yes. I don't know who he is.
- Q. And as you said a little earlier, Rabinowitch is a rather common name?
- A Quite a common name.
- Q But you can find in Exhibit 39, on page 3, that they found you?
- A In the office?
- Q. Both places, as a matter of fact, is it not? It says *Home telephone, Lancaster 7028* which you told us a moment ago was your telephone number?
- A. Yes.
- Q And your residence on Pine Avenue?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q And *Business - Plateau 2507*, which you admitted was your telephone number?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. At the place you were working?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And the address: 539 Pine Avenue, was also?
- A. Is my address.
- Q Is your address?
- A. Yes.
- Q So at the beginning they did not know where to locate you, and the document says that *Datie* tried hard to locate you at these various phone numbers without success, but in the other document mentioned, that which you are seeing now, written in Russian also —
- A. Yes.
- Q. They located *Hermine Rabinowitch*?
- A. Yes. I guess they can trace a phone number.
- Q I just wanted to show you that their records are in order. Then they gave on this page a history, is it not?
- A. Yes.

Two weeks later, that is on the 5th May, 1944, Koudriavtzev went to Montreal and had a meeting with *Germina Rabinowitch* and allowed her to read a letter addressed "*Dear Hermine*" and signed "*Gisel*". Evidently Koudriavtzev kept this because Gouzenko produced it. It reads as follows: —

Dear Hermina,

Thank you very much indeed for your care in our affairs and we hope that you will help us in future. It is important for us to send a letter to Geneva to Sisi. Can you send this letter with a reliable man to whom you trust. All expenses will be paid. Please let us know about your proposals in this connection as soon as possible. Please inform us about delivery of your service mail to Geneva and why are you sure that it is not censored. Please wire to Rachel or Alexander that Gisel's parents are interested about the health of Sisi and Paul and that they will help them. We ask you to forward 10,000 \$ to that watch company according to the Sisi's instructions. Make arrangements with our representative about forwarding of this sum of money to you in USA. All your personal expenses will be paid.

With best regards

Gisel

Before being shown this document Germana Rabanowitch was questioned on this transfer of money and she then admitted having made a trip to New York to have an amount of \$10,000 conveyed to Geneva by the watch company referred to in the evidence now to be quoted —

Q. Did you send money to Switzerland?

A. I did send money to Switzerland.

Q. How much?

A. I do not know; he was always in difficulties.

Q. You what? You do not know? What do you mean you do not know? How much money did you send to Switzerland in 1944?

A. I did not send any money. I asked somebody to help my cousin out with money if possible.

Q. Listen —

A. I do not know exactly the amount.

Q. Will you listen, you are not going to trifle with this Commission. You just said a few minutes ago you did send money to Switzerland, to that cousin, and then you said you did not remember the amount.

A. I did send but not in that sense that I went and sent it.

Q. I do not care anything about the sense. You did send money?

A. No.

- Q. Now you have said "yes" and you have said "no", which is it?
- A. May I explain?
- Q. Yes.
- A. I asked somebody who had connections, who had business between Switzerland and the United States to give A_____ if possible some money because he also was cut off from his funds in the States which were blocked.
- Q. Never mind the reason, who was the somebody you asked?
- A. That was a big firm.
- Q. What is the name?
- A. *(No audible answer).*
- Q. Was that a watch company?
- A. Yes.
- Q. What is the name of the company?
- A. I do not remember.
- Q. You will make an effort to remember the name of the watch company, will you?
- A. Well, it is a long time ago.
- Q. Yes, all right, but you think of it and you give us the name of the firm.
- A. *(No audible answer.)*
- Q. New York?
- A. Yes, New York Geneva. It was not -well, can you help me?
- Q. No, we are waiting for your assistance.
- Q. There are not such a large number of watch companies in New York that would send money to Switzerland on your request. You say that you cannot remember the name, what is the name?
- A. Well, I do not know because—
- Q. What is the name?
- A. I know it is "H-e", something like Herman, but not Herman.
- Q. And the amount you sent was \$10,000?
- A. I do not know that he could give him \$10,000.
- Q. The amount you sent was \$10,000?
- A. No, I asked him to give him some money
- Q. You asked him to give him how much?
- A. I do not know how much he would give him.
- Q. How much did you ask him to give?
- A. Up to \$5,000 or \$6,000.

Q. Up to five or six thousand?

A. Yes.

Q. You wanted to have some assistance as far as the name of that company was concerned?

A. Yes.

Q. You stated that the name of the company was "H-e" and something?

A. Yes.

Q. Helbein?

A. Yes, I remember that.

Q. What is the address?

A. It is somewhere on Fifth Avenue.

Q. Whom did you communicate with there?

A. With a gentleman—Mr. Helbein.

Q. What is his first name?

A. William.

Q. What is his occupation?

A. He is the head of the watch company.

Q. He is the head?

A. Of this company.

Q. What is the name of the company?

A. Helbein Watch Company.

Q. Helbein Watch Company, and what is the address of the company?

A. It is on Fifth Avenue in one of the 40's.

Q. What is the name of the building where the company has its office?

A. I do not know.

Q. Why did you wait so long to tell us the address of the company, you knew it?

A. The address; I did not know the exact address.

Q. You just gave it to us.

A. Fifth Avenue in the 40's. You did not ask me for the address.

Q. May I recall that when you are under oath you have to say the whole truth and nothing but the truth, you should not limit yourself to answering the questions but should tell everything that is implied in the question. You understand that?

A. Yes. You asked me the name, and I could not remember; the address I remember.

Q. How long have you known that firm?

A. I knew it in Geneva.

A. Yes. It is 5th Avenue and one of the forty streets.

Q. 6 West 48th Street?

A. Yes. That is at the corner of Fifth Avenue.

Q. You remember it was at the corner of Fifth Avenue?

A. Yes.

Q. So there is no doubt in your mind as to where the company had its office?

A. I said so before.

Later, and still before being shown the document, Rabinowitch stated that her trip to New York and her visit to the Soviet Embassy were two different things and had nothing in common:—

Q. That is not the question. Why did you go to the Embassy?

A. To transmit the cable A_____ sent me to ask for money for this woman, Rachel!

Q. Why did you not go to New York City directly? Why did you trouble the Soviet people here in Canada for that?

A. Well, they had nothing in common, those things. The two things have nothing in common.

Faced with the document, she then testified:—

Q. So we will continue, reading Exhibit 40:—

Dear Hermima,

Thank you very much indeed for your care in our affairs and we hope that you will help us in future. It is important for us to send a letter to Geneva to Sisi. Can you send this letter with a reliable man to whom you trust. All expenses will be paid. Please let us know about your proposals in this connection as soon as possible. Please inform us about delivery of your service mail to Geneva and why are you sure that it is not censored. Please wire to Rachel or Alexander that Gisel's parents are interested about the health of Sisi and Paul and that they will help them. We ask you to forward \$10,000 to that watch company according to the Sisi's instructions. Make arrangements with our representative

about forwarding of this sum of money in U.S.A. All your personal expenses will be paid.

*With best regards,
GISEL.*

What do you say to that?

A. *It didn't reach me.*

Q You see the connection between the \$10,000?

A. Yes.

Q The Soviet Embassy, the watch company, you were travelling to New York; Sisi; A_____?

A. *(No answer.)*

Q. Now you might tell us all about it, and take your time, Miss Rabinowitch?

A. But I don't see it exactly.

Q. Just take your time and tell us all about it?

A I see that they tried to use me as if I would have been their agent, and they put me in a nice mess. That is what I see, but I never was close to them and I don't want to be their agent and I didn't want to be their agent.

Q. Would you care to tell us what took place, then, or if you would prefer not to; and if so, why?

A *(No answer.)*

Q Would you like to consult your Counsel?

A If I might have time to clear my memory. Am I permitted?

Q Yes; I am waiting for you.

Q Do you want to talk to your lawyer?

A Yes.

COUNSEL FOR WITNESS:—Would you like to talk to me?

WITNESS:—Yes.

COUNSEL FOR WITNESS:—In here or outside?

WITNESS:—I would like to talk outside. I could not talk here.

After the return of the witness with her Counsel, the examination continued—

Q Well, Miss Rabinowitch, you have had the opportunity to withdraw from the room and consult with your solicitor. What is your decision?

A I will explain it to you exactly, and explain why I didn't say this.

Q. Will you speak a little louder?

A. Why I didn't say it before, the New York business. But please believe me that I don't remember two letters; I definitely don't remember two letters. I rather remember the second letter, because of the amount of \$10,000. I didn't want to say this about New York, because I didn't want to say about the watch company, which did a favour, but as it is already known I don't change anything, as I see —

Q. But what is already known?

A. That you have the information about Helbein's Watch Company. I don't see why I must be too careful.

Q. Why should you be careful anyway?

A. I don't know.

Q. Do you intend to tell us only things that we know?

A. I didn't want to bring in other people if possible.

Q. But you are here to tell the truth, you see, and all the truth. You are under oath, whether you implicate others or not

A. That is true.

Q. Go ahead and tell us the story now?

A. I was approached — I went to New York on one of my trips. I went there several times a year, as I have said, and I was approached in New York by a man I don't know. I don't know his name, and he handed me \$10,000, with a request to give it to the watch company, to Helbein, for A_____; and I did that.

Q. So what you told us this morning was false, and when you said that now you did not think you had to be too careful, will you explain that?

A. Excuse me.

Q. Why did you tell us something this morning that was untrue?

A. I was confused. I am sorry.

Q. That is no answer. A person does not tell something deliberately untrue because they are confused, but because they have a very definite purpose in mind. Why did you tell us something this morning that was untrue?

A. Because I did not want to implicate Helbein.

Q. To implicate whom?

A. Helbein.

Q. What you say now is this. You say that you had that letter, which is Exhibit 40, and which refers to a watch company?

A. Which what?

Q. Which refers to the watch company?

A. Yes.

Q. *You had that letter?*

A. *Yes, sir.*

Q. You received it from *Gisel*; and you say in addition to that you went to New York and that someone in New York whom you do not know — ?

A. Exactly.

Q. Just a moment; just listen to my question carefully. You say that someone in New York, whom you did not know, approached you with \$10,000 and asked you to give that amount of money to the watch company. Is that what you say?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And then that person must have known that you were coming to New York?

A. Yes.

Q. Because you do not meet people in New York — any person in New York would not meet at the very moment in that city a person going there, to arrange a transaction of that kind, which would fit in so beautifully with that document, and all that as a coincidence?

A. They knew I was going there.

Q. They knew? How did they know? You told them that?

A. I told them.

Q. You told who?

A. I told the man who brought me this letter.

Q. Who was the man who brought you the letter?

A. I don't know him.

Q. That is Exhibit 40?

A. I don't know his name.

Q. Where did he bring you the letter?

A. It was in Montreal.

Q. He brought you the letter in Montreal?

A. Yes.

Q. He is a Russian, but you don't know his name. Is that it?

A. I don't know even if he is Russian.

Q. What did he tell you when he brought the letter to you?

A. He asked me my name, and he said he had a letter for me.

Q. And he gave you that letter?

A. Yes.

Q. When was that?

A. That must have been in the spring of 1944.

Q. And where were you when he handed the letter to you?

A. In the office.

Q. In your office?

A. Yes.

Q. Had you ever seen this man before?

A. No, sir.

Q. How did he introduce himself?

A. Just brought me that letter.

Q. He said he had a letter for you?

A. Yes.

Q. And handed you the letter?

A. Yes.

Q. And Exhibit 40 is the letter?

A. Excuse me? This letter.

Q. Exhibit 40; and did he tell you anything else?

A. He asked me whether I will be going to New York soon, and I said I would be going in the spring, and then he said that a man will approach me and give me the money for A_____, and would I transmit it to Mr. Helbern for transfer to A_____, and I said yes, I would.

.

Q. But you had had Exhibit 40 and had read it?

A. Yes. I knew it was to be given to her, but the money was going to A_____.

Q. Just to hand over to D_____. Is that so?

A. Yes.

Q. And who was *Gisel*?

A. I think that must be a friend of Rachel's.

Q. Anybody ever tell you who *Gisel* was?

A. No.

Q. Did you ever ask?

A. No.

Q. I see. So you got this letter signed *Gisel*, and you got these instructions about going to New York and everything you have told us, and you never even asked anybody who the person was who signed the letter. Is that so?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. I see. So you must have been satisfied where the letter came from; quite satisfied in your own mind. Would that be right?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And satisfied that it came from somebody who knew you well enough to address you as "*Dear Hermina*." Is that so?

A. I didn't quite understand that the letter came from somebody—

Q. Who knew you well enough to address you as "*Dear Hermina*"?

A. It doesn't mean that that person knows me well enough if she writes "*Dear Hermina*".

Q. And following that meeting in New York, did you send any cable or write any letter?

A. I sent a cable saying that I saw Helbern and that I did what was asked, or something like that.

Q. You sent a cable to whom?

A. A_____

Q. What did you say?

A. That I saw Mr. Helbern in New York and I did what I was asked to do.

.

Q. Did they offer to pay your expenses?

A. Yes.

Q. Who did?

A. The fellow who brought the letter.

Q. Who brought the money?

A. Who brought the letter.

Q. But the one who brought the money did not mention anything about it?

A. No.

Q. And you did not ask him?

A. No.

Q. When you got the money you went to see the watch company?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you saw the President of the company?

A. Yes, sir.

.

Q. You said, Miss Rabinowitch, that the man who brought you that letter in Montreal came from the Russian Embassy in Ottawa?

A. Yes, sir. Well, I don't know whether he came from the Embassy.

Q. You stated he was a man from the Embassy?

A. Well, I assumed that.

Q. You had good reason to assume that?

A. Exactly.

.

Q. I want to have that clear. When this man brought this letter to you in Montreal, was the letter sealed or not sealed?

A. Not sealed.

Q. Did the man ask you to read the letter, or did he just hand an envelope to you with the letter in it?

A. No, he asked me to read the letter.

Q. The man from the Soviet Embassy in Ottawa brought a letter to you and asked you to read it, and you read it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. After you read that letter did you speak to him or did he speak to you?

A. He asked me whether I would be going to New York.

Q. He asked you whether you would accept to do what was asked of you in the letter?

A. Yes.

Q. And you agreed?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you told him so?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What did he say to that?

A. He asked when I would be going to New York.

Q. He asked what time you would be ready to accomplish the task, and you gave him a date when you would leave?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And what else was said?

A. Where I could meet that man.

- Q. Did you ask him where you could meet the man, or did he ask you where you would suggest the meeting take place?
- A. *(No answer.)*
- Q. Put it this way. Whether you suggested it or whether he suggested it, you agreed with him as to the time of the trip, as to the time of the meeting, and as to the place of the meeting?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. That is right?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And you came to that agreement after having read the letter at the request of the man who brought it to you?
- A. Yes.
- Q. You did not ask the man who is *Gisel*?
- A. No.
- Q. Because you knew who he was? You do not take instructions that way from anyone, do you?
- A. No.
- Q. You knew that *Gisel* was the man in charge of the Intelligence Service at the Soviet Embassy here?
- A. No. I don't know that.
- Q. You knew he was connected with these activities, didn't you?
- A. Who?
- Q. The man who signed "*Gisel*"?
- A. No, I didn't know.
- Q. Who did you think that *Gisel* was, then?
- A. I knew that it was somebody connected with the Soviet —
- Q. The Soviet Embassy in Ottawa?
- A. Or maybe in Moscow.
- Q. All right, maybe in Moscow. You read the letter, as you stated. It said, *thank you very much indeed for your care in our affairs*. What care did you have in their affairs up to then?
- A. Transmitting the letter.
- Q. That was not agreed yet?
- A. Transmitting the letter I got from Geneva.
- Q. That is right; you had already transmitted the letter; so this man, either from Moscow or from the Soviet Embassy, was thanking you indeed for the care you had in their own affairs; and he con-

tinues, *We hope you will help us in the future.* That is along the same line of business, is it not?

A. That means to transmit the money.

Q. Yes, but it is not qualified, it is not limited. What *Gisel* says is that he hopes you will continue to help in the future, isn't that it?

A. That is what it says.

Q. And that is what you understood, too?

A. No.

Q. What did you understand, then?

A. I was prepared to come and to transmit that money.

Q. You thought it was in connection with the balance of the letter?

A. Yes. I was not prepared to do anything any more, I had enough to do.

Q. I think you were doing your share?

A. More than that.

Q. I continue

It is important for us to send a letter to Geneva to Sisi. Can you send this letter with a reliable man to whom you trust?

Was that letter, the letter directed to Sisi, handed over with this letter, or were they speaking about a future transaction?

A. I believe they referred to something more, and I refused to do anything more.

Q. You did not tell me that when I asked you what took place between you and the man. If you refused, you refused afterward, but not at that time?

A. At that time I told him I can't do that.

Q. You told him that?

A. Yes.

Q. You told him you could not arrange for a letter?

A. No.

.

Q. All right. Did you tell the man from the Embassy who handed you Exhibit 40 why you were sure that such material was not censored?

A. Well, I told him --

Q. You must have told him, because you read the letter in his presence, at his request, and you must have given him the reason why you were sure that it was not censored?

A. Maybe.

Q. Well, did you tell him, as a matter of fact? Here is a man who comes to your place?

A. Yes.

Q. With a request in writing; and who asked you to read the letter. You read the letter, and you agreed to what is asked in the letter, and there is a query in the letter about your assurance about the fact that these letters are not censored?

A. Yes.

Q. Is it not reasonable to deduce, and is not that the only deduction possible, that you explained why to him?

A. Yes, I explained to him, saying that such facilities exist, but that I refused to use them.

Q. All right, we will leave it at that, and we will continue the reading of the letter. In the letter the man from the Embassy asked you:

Please wire to Rachel or Alexander that Gisel's parents are interested about the health of Sisi and Paul and that they will help them.

That is in connection with the \$10,000 is it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. As a matter of fact, Sisi was not sick, but she was in financial difficulties?

A. Does it say that she is sick?

Q. Yes, about her health. It is a word to cover the financial assistance to which reference was made in the previous documents. Is that right?

A. I don't know.

Q. Well, is it what you understood yourself? You are asked by Gisel, the man from the Embassy, to wire Rachel, which is Sisi, or Alexander; which is A_____?

A. Yes.

Q. That Gisel's parents — that is the friends of the man in the Embassy here — are interested about the health of Sisi. That is about her financial position?

A. Yes, her financial position.

Q. And that they will help her. In other words, it means to inform these people that "we have agreed to do what was asked of us; that is, to get financial assistance"?

A. Yes.

Q. But who is *Paul*?

A. *Sisi's* husband.

Q. Did you wire *Rachel* or *Alexander*, as you were asked in this letter, that finally you had succeeded in interesting the people in the Soviet Embassy here, and they would look after them and send \$10,000 to them?

A. I think so. I am not very sure, but I think so.

Q. It is reasonable to deduce that you did?

A. Yes.

Q. It goes on:

We ask you to forward \$10,000 to that watch company according to the Sisi's instructions. Make arrangements with our representative about forwarding of this sum of money to you in USA

In that letter they are asking you to make arrangements with the Soviet representative in New York—?

A. Yes.

.

Q. When you gave the money, the \$10,000, to William Helheim, what did you tell him? What did he say?

A. That he would try to do his best to transfer it.

Q. You stated a moment ago that you did not want to implicate him, so you have a conviction that he knew the nature of the transaction?

A. No. I don't know.

Q. You don't know whether he did or not?

A. No. I really don't know.

Q. But did you explain it to him?

A. Explain what?

Q. You did not give \$10,000 without telling him what you want to do with it. Did you explain to William Helheim the nature of the transaction?

A. I explained to him that I would like him to transmit it to _____; that is all.

Q. Would you tell me why the Russians would have to go through you to do that? Could they not do that in New York, without you going there? That gentleman who came to see you at the

hotel with the \$10,000 could have gone to the watch company and asked them to do that. Why did they have to use you?

A. I really don't know.

Q. You have no idea?

A. Perhaps because I was the cousin of A_____, and there was nothing so particular about that.

Q. Well, you were the cousin of A_____, but that was not a gift as between relatives, was it?

A. No.

Q. Then why would they have to use you to do that?

A. I don't know why.

Q. Is it because they wanted to avoid suspicion of that?

A. Maybe.

Q. Well, what is your idea? Or was it because you were known to them?

A. I think rather that they wanted to avoid suspicion.

Q. That is the impression you had?

A. Yes.

Q. Suspicious of what?

A. Of Helbein, perhaps.

Q. You speak of secrecy and of suspicion, but what did you think the suspicion would be about? You believed that other people would find it strange?

A. Yes.

Q. That the Russian Embassy would send \$10,000 to *Sisi* in Switzerland?

A. Yes.

Q. But did you not find it strange yourself?

A. I did.

Q. You thought it was for what? Strange in what way?

A. Strange because the amount of money was high, and because of this whole secrecy.

Q. So the high amount of money and the secrecy brought in your mind that there must be something behind that, so that is why you found it strange?

A. Yes.

Q. What did you think was behind that?

A. I thought that *Sisi* must be working for the Russians.

Q. Be working for the Russians?

A. Yes.

In document number three already referred to†, Motinov has recorded the report made to him by Koudriavtzev, upon the latter's return from Montreal, of his interview with Rabinowitch referred to in the evidence just quoted. This document reads:—

On May 5 Leon met Hermina, the latter reported:

1. The correspondence with Geneva is carried on by means of letters and telegrams. The letters are sent as part of the mail of her organization and are not subject to scrutiny. The letters take from three weeks to a month to come. Telegrams a few days. The last letter took about one month to arrive, she does not know the exact number of days.
2. She knows not Geta A _____ but Aleksander A _____. She does not correspond with him, but she could. She knows that everything is in order with him. She also informed that in June 1941 he intended to go to Moscow but the beginning of the war interfered and he remained there. His visa was of 24 June.
3. She knows Sisi as a good friend and she helped her as a good acquaintance. She did not know anything about Sisi's work previously. Sisi's first letter was for me unexpected. She knows nothing of the change in Sisi's life.
4. She is completely certain that the letters were written personally by Sisi. Indications:—hand-writing and signature, which were well known to her.
5. The insistent request of Sisi to deposit the money in the company was unknown to her, and furthermore she does not know anybody in the said company. As for herself she considers that Sisi told the firm about me (Hermina).

Hermina will be able to deposit the money, however she would like to receive a cheque, as it is difficult to carry such a large sum over the border. Hermina enjoys rights equal to persons who have diplomatic passports.

†See p. 166 above.

Conduct—natural. She wrote the letters to Tounkin because Tounkin had received her very severely once, while the other requests about a meeting and the telephone conversations were rejected, which sharply contrasts with my reception in Moscow where the reception was very warm.

She considers that there is no suspicion whatsoever about her. In her opinion letters sent from her town to our town appear to be not subjected to censorship.

The regular meeting was set for 17 of May, on May 20 she leaves for Philadelphia on her own office business and could take advantage of this journey as a good pretext, for handing over the money.

Appearance—A stout woman about 45 years, lame in both legs, moves with the aid of two sticks, but at the same time drives her own car.

Conclusion—the meeting under the cover of both contacts passed entirely normally.

I request your further directives.

6.5.44 Lamont.

On this Rabinowitch testified as follows:—

With regard to the first paragraph:—

Q. . . . I refer you now to Exhibit 41, another Russian document brought by the cipher clerk. It is headed *5 May Leon*—that is Koudriavtzev—*met Hermma*. The latter reported:—

1. The correspondence with Geneva is carried on with the aid of letters and telegrams. The letters we sent as part of the mail of her organization . . .

That is, the I.L.O.

. . . and are not subject to scrutiny. The letters take from three weeks to a month. Telegrams several days. The last letter took about one month, she does not know the exact number of days.

That is in the documents of the Russian Embassy, a recital of a conversation, of information that you gave to that Russian gentleman, and which was asked, as you can see, in the letter that was addressed to you and which is signed *Gisel*. Do you remember now having had that conversation?

A. That is the conversation I referred to.

Q. And that is the information you gave to the man as indicated by this Russian document here?

A. Yes.

Q. All right.

Q. Does that, paragraph No. 1, which has been read to you, correctly set out that part of the interview between you and Koudriavtzev?

A. What should I say?

Q. The truth.

A. Yes.

Q. All right. We will go to the next one.

Q. Then if that sets out the truth, there is a statement in there:—

The letters we sent as part of the mail of her organization—

That means that the letters which the Russian Embassy sent as part of the I.L.O. mail?

A. Excuse me? I did not understand the question.

Q. That says:—

The letters we sent as part of the mail of her organization—

That says that the Soviet Embassy sent letters through the I.L.O. organization?

A. No, sir.

Q. And you said —?

A. No. That does not say it.

Q. You read that, and you said that correctly —?

A. No, he doesn't — it is not that.

Q. Then what do you say it is?

A. It doesn't say anything about letters of the Embassy through the I.L.O.

Q. Then will you translate the Russian for me and tell me what it does say, that second sentence?

A. It speaks in general about letters.

Q. Will you translate it, please?

A. *The correspondence with Geneva is carried on through letters and telegrams.*

Q. I asked you to translate the second sentence.

A. It is a kind of code.

Q. Never mind; just translate it?

A. I can't translate it word for word. *The letters are sent—* I don't understand. There are words missing. I don't understand what it means.

Q. The translation we have, and to which you agreed, is this. —

The letters we sent as part of the mail of her organization and are not subject to scrutiny.

A. But it does not say *we sent*. It says *sent*, in the third person. It does not say *we sent*.

Q. That is what you have to say about the translation?

A. Yes.

Q. But other than that, you accept that as being correct?

The letters take from three weeks to a month.

A. Yes.

Q. And —

Telegrams several days.

A. Yes.

Q. And —

The last letter took about one month, she does not know the exact number of days.

A. Yes.

In fact Rabinowitch had received the two letters from Geneva which are recited in first of the above-mentioned documents, the first about 9th March and the second before the 13th April, 1944.

1. *As to the second paragraph:—*

Q. Then let us go to the second paragraph:—

2. She knows not Geta A_____ but Aleksander A_____. She does not correspond with him but she could.

Q. Meaning that you can in the future?

A. (No answer.)

Q. Are you satisfied with the translation now, witness?

A. It is difficult, because there are words missing in the Russian.

Q. Are you satisfied with the translation of the sentence, *She does not correspond with him, but she can do so?*

A. I can't say satisfactorily, because I don't understand the Russian text. It was done — you see what I mean, there are words missing in the Russian. Therefore I have no opinion on the translation.

Q. I see.

Q. You agree that whatever the translation of the document may say, the document as we have it says that you reported to Koudriavtzev

on May 5 that you did not know Geta A_____ but Alexander A_____. Is that true?

A. I don't remember that we spoke about that, but I know now that I don't know anybody by the name of Geta A_____.

Q. All right. The report also says that you stated to Koudriavtzev that you did not correspond with A_____ but that you could in the future?

A. I don't agree with that.

Q. Continuing to quote:—

She knows that everything is in order with him. She also informed that in June 1941 he intended to go to Moscow but the beginning of the war interfered and he remained there. His visa was of 24 June.

Do you remember having said that to Koudriavtzev in the course of that interview between you and him on May 5?

A. I don't remember.

Q. But you do not deny it?

A. I don't deny the fact that A_____ was supposed to go to Moscow.

Q. That is not the question. Do you deny the facts which are stated in that paragraph, which I read to you, that on the occasion of the meeting you had with Koudriavtzev of the Soviet Embassy, you reported to him that you did not know Geta A_____, but that you knew Alexander A_____? That you did not correspond with him, but that you could? That you knew he was all right, that everything was in order with him, and that you informed that in June of 1941 he intended to go to Moscow but the war interfered and he remained there, and that his visa was of 27 June? Is that right? Did you give that information to Koudriavtzev on May 5?

A. No, I don't remember that.

Q. You don't remember, but do you deny that you did, or do you just say that you don't remember?

A. I just say I don't remember.

Q. Did you know that he intended to go to Moscow in 1941?

A. Yes. That is what I mean, I knew the fact that he was supposed to go to Moscow in 1941.

Q. You knew that fact, but the Russians did not? Who told them?

A. I don't know. It is astonishing that they would know. They didn't know me.

Q. It is astonishing that they would know it, unless you told them?

A. No. They could have known all about it without me.

Q. How did you know he was going to Moscow in 1941, or that he intended to go to Moscow in 1941?

A. He told me so. He wrote me so. It is long ago, in 1941.

Q. And did you know his visa was of June 27?

A. I don't know that. That is what I think I could not have told that.

3. *As to the third paragraph:—*

Q. The third paragraph goes:—

3. She knows Sisi as a good friend and helped her as a good acquaintance. She did not know anything about Sisi's work previously. Sisi's first letter was for me unexpected. About Sisi's circumstances she knows nothing.

Did you report that to Koudriavtzev, or did you not?

A. Yes, I told him that I didn't know what Sisi was doing.

Q. So you agree with that paragraph?

A. Yes, sir.

4. *As to the fourth paragraph:—*

Q. Then paragraph 4:—

She is fully convinced that the letters were written personally by Sisi.

That is the letter which you received.

Indications —handwriting and signature, which are well known to her.

A. I didn't say that, because as I said before the letter was typed; I remember.

Q. It is a fact that Sisi's handwriting was well known to you?

A. No. I never corresponded with Sisi. That I affirm definitely, that can't be true. I never had in my life a letter from her.

5. *As to the fifth paragraph:—*

Q. Then paragraph 5:—

5. The insistent request of Sisi to deposit the money in the company is unknown to her and furthermore she does not

know anybody in the said company As for herself she considers that Sisi told the firm about me.

That is about Hermuna?

A. Yes.

Q. Is that right; did you tell him that?

A. Yes

6. *As to the sixth paragraph:—*

Q. Then the next paragraph:—

Hermuna will be able to deposit the money, however she would like to receive a cheque as it is difficult to carry such a large sum over the border. Hermuna enjoys rights equal to persons who have diplomatic passports.

That you told him also during the interview?

A. No. I refused to carry money across the border.

Q. That is what he says. Is that right?

A. Yes. I refused to carry money, but also cheques I refused.

Q. That is what the document says you told him?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. So that is right?

A. Yes.

Q. I will read it to you again:—

Hermuna will be able to deposit the money, however she would like to receive a cheque as it is difficult to carry such a large sum over the border. Hermuna enjoys rights equal to persons who have diplomatic passports.

So you say what appears in that paragraph is right?

A. Yes.

7. *As to the seventh paragraph:—*

Q. Then the next paragraph apparently says that your conduct is natural?

A. (No answer).

Q. It goes on:—

She wrote the letters to Tounkin because Tounkin had received her very severely once—

That is right?

A. Yes.

Q. It goes on:—

—while the other requests about a meeting and the telephone conversations were rejected,—

That is right, too?

A. Yes.

Q. It goes on:—

—which sharply contrasts with my (Hermann's) reception in Moscow, where the reception was very warm.

A. What?

Q. Is that right?

A. No.

Q. Well, maybe the weather is different in Moscow than in Montreal, but what do you say to that last part? You say that all the paragraph is right except that particular sentence about the reception in Moscow?

A. No; there are other paragraphs.

Q. No, I am talking about that paragraph. Let us talk about it. We took long enough about the other things. You say everything in it is right, except about the reception in Moscow, which was very wrong. I did not write that, the Russian gentleman in the Soviet Embassy wrote it, and that is what they say you reported to Koudriavtzev during the interview you had with him in Montreal?

A. (No answer.)

Q. What do you say?

A. I say that I don't see what kind of reception he refers to.

Q. That is not what you are asked. You are asked if everything else in that paragraph but the reference to the reception you received in Moscow is correct?

A. I don't understand it. I don't know what it means.

Q. Would you listen to the question. Is the paragraph, with the exception of the reference to your reception in Moscow, correct?

A. Yes.

Q. And how do you explain that Koudriavtzev would have made that report about your conversation in relation to Moscow, unless you referred to that?

A. In a very general way I told him it could have been. That is the way I understand it, but that is not the way I think people generally meet somebody.

Q So the whole paragraph, with that qualification, recites exactly what you told him? The whole paragraph, with the qualification that you make about what is said about Moscow, is true?

A With that qualification, yes; it could be true.

Q I am not asking you whether it could be. I am asking you whether you did not in fact, as it is reported in that Russian document, tell that to Koudriavtzev while he visited you in Montreal on May 5?

A Yes, I could.

Q It continues:—

She considers that there is no suspicion whatsoever about her. Did you tell Mr Koudriavtzev that you considered yourself not suspected?

A Yes, sir.

Q Then, it says:—

In her opinion letters being sent to her town from our town —

COMMISSIONER:—That is from Ottawa to Montreal.

Q —appear to be not subject to the censor.

A What does that mean?

Q Koudriavtzev reports that you told him on the occasion of the visit on May 5, that the letters coming from Montreal to Ottawa were not censored. Do you remember having said that to him?

A No.

Q You might, but you don't remember?

A I don't remember.

Q It goes on:—

The regular meeting was set for 17 of May, on May 20 she leaves for Philadelphia on her own office business and could take advantage of this journey as a good pretext, for handing over the money.

Is that true? You remember that this morning we had a few references to that Philadelphia trip of yours?

A Yes, as I said, I went to Philadelphia.

Q And what this man reports that you told him during that interview of May 5, then, is correct?

A Yes.

8 *As to the eighth paragraph:—*

Q. All right. It goes on:—

Appearance — stout woman 45 years, lame in both legs, moves with the aid of two sticks, but at the same time drives her own car.

Conclusion — the meeting under the cover of both contacts passed entirely normally.

Is that right, what I have just read to you?

A. Yes.

With regard to the first sentence just above quoted Germina Rabinowitch testified —

Q. What is the make of car that you were driving?

A. Ford.

Q. Ford, what year?

A. 1939.

Q. Have you your licence?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Will you show it to me, please? You are exhibiting licence 4913 as issued by the Quebec Revenue Office for coach, Ford serial G-5719105, issued to Miss Germina Rabinowitch, Montreal, 539 Pine Avenue West, on April 25, 1946. The other licence bears No. 59162 issued by the same bureau in the same province. That is your driver's licence?

A. Yes.

Q. Which was issued on the same date?

A. Yes, sir.

Reverting to the eighth paragraph mentioned above:—

Q. And then Mr. Motinov says, possibly, to Gisel:—

I request your further directives.

This is quite accurate, this document, is it not?

COMMISSIONER. Miss Rabinowitch, you told Mr. Fauteux a few moments ago that you had told Koudriavtzev that you considered that there was no suspicion whatever about you. That was true? You told him that?

COUNSEL.—Yes, she told me that.

COMMISSIONER — Mr. Fauteux read you the following sentence:—

She considers that there is no suspicion whatsoever about her.

You told that to Koudriavtzev?

A. That was in the letter. I don't remember.

COMMISSIONER —Now don't start to change that. You understand perfectly the questions put to you.

COUNSEL — In the interview of May 5 you told Koudriavtzev that you considered you were not suspected. You told that to me a moment ago?

A. Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER:—You were not suspected of what?

A. I don't know.

Q. Why would you tell him you were not suspected if there was no possibility of your being suspected?

A. I really don't know. I am not suspected; that is all.

Q. Well, I do. It is as plain as anything. You told him you were not suspected of working in collaboration with the Russians. That is what you meant, didn't you?

A. If I meant it, it is true.

The fourth document, written in Russian by Motinov, reads as follows —

31.7.44. Leon met Hermina, the latter reported that she had handed over the money to the owner of the firm, but he did not know anything about this money. After this she sent a telegram to A _____ and a few days later he answered her that he had not received the money. Leon advised her to send another telegram to A _____ and one to the owner of the firm.

Regular meeting on 1 or 4.9.44 at 21 (possibly 15?) Leon has the times of the meeting smudged. On McTavish St.

Task—the characteristics of the institution.

28.8.44. Leon met Hermina, the latter reported that she had not received confirmation from A _____ about receipt of the money, but she received a telegram from the head of the firm in New York, who advised that he had received a telegram from A _____ with the contents "Thanks for the warm

greetings." She considers that the money has been received. At the present time it does not seem possible to send a man to Geneva. There is no reliable man and link with Geneva.

Address of A _____:

Business: Geneva International Labour Office.

Home: _____ Chemin _____, Geneva

Regular meeting 28.9 at 9.00 (21) McTavish St.

Questioned on this document, Rabinowitch testified —

Q. It says "*Leon*" — that is Koudriavtzev — "*met Hermine*".
Is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. And it goes on:—

... the latter reported that she had given the money to the owner of the firm but he did not know anything about this money.

Is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. And it goes on:—

After this she sent a telegram to A_____.

Did you?

A. Yes.

Q. And it goes on:—

... and after a few days, he answered that he had not received the money.

Is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. Then it says that *Leon*, which is Koudriavtzev, —
—advised her—

That is, advised you

—to send another telegram to A_____ and one to the owner of the firm.

Is that right? Did you send a telegram to A_____, and a telegram to the owner of the firm, to William Helber?

A. I don't remember.

Q. You don't remember, but you don't deny it?

A. I don't deny it.

Q. All right. Then there is another meeting on August 4, 1944, at 21 hours. Koudriavtzev arranged a meeting on McTavish Street; the time of the meeting is apparently smudged.

Q. Did you meet him on McTavish Street?

A. I met him once there.

Q. That is the third time?

Q. The next paragraph starts with the word *Task* so you were given a task. It goes on:—

The characteristics of the institution.

Presumably that is the place you were working. Do you remember that he asked you that?

A. He asked me some information about the I.L.O.; that is all.

Q. So the document is true, then?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you furnish that information?

A. Yes.

Q. In what form?

A. I gave him some publications of the I.L.O. which are public; and I gave him a short description of the structure.

Q. Written by yourself?

A. Yes.

Q. Anything else?

A. No.

Q. Did you express any opinions?

A. No.

Q. As to the staff; as to their abilities; as to their ideas; as to their political views?

A. I gave certain characteristics of some of the members of the staff.

Q. That is not my question. Did you give your opinion —

A. I gave some characteristics as to the various persons on the staff.

Q. And their political views?

A. No.

Q. Their sympathy with Russia?

A. I don't think so. No.

Q. Their sympathy with Communism?

A. No.

Q. You say you don't think so?

A. Certainly not Communism.

Q. But Russia, perhaps?

A. Russia, perhaps.

Q. Exhibit 42† goes on to say that on August 28, 1944, Koudriavtzev again met Hermina. Is that true? Is that right?

A. Maybe.

Q. All right; let us see what took place:—

The latter informed that she had not received confirmation from A_____ about receipt of the money—

Is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. It goes on:—

—but she received a telegram from the head of the firm in New York, who advised that he had received a telegram from A_____ of the contents, "Thanks for the warm greetings."

Do you remember that?

A. No.

Q. It goes on:—

She considers that the money has been received.

Did you tell him that?

A. (No answer.)

Q. I think if you read the document very slowly you will agree to all that is there?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you agree to that? I don't want to go through all the process of putting questions to you?

A. Yes.

Q. You remember that?

A. Yes.

Q. You remember that you met him; you met Koudriavtzev on August 28, 1944?

A. Yes.

Q. And that you informed him that you had not received confirmation from A_____ about receipt of the money, that is the \$10,000, but had received a telegram from the head of the firm in New York, that is William Helbein, who advised that he had received a telegram from A_____ of the text, "Thanks for the warm greetings", and that you considered that the money had been received?

†The fourth document; see p. 604 above.

A. Yes. I don't remember the details, but that is the substance.

Q. That is the substance of what took place at that interview on that date?

A. Yes.

Q. Then this exhibit goes on:—

At the present time it does not seem possible to send a man to Geneva. There is no reliable man and link with Geneva.

Is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. And it continues:—

Address of A_____: business: Geneva, International Labour Office.

That is a good address?

A. Yes.

Q. And Sisi was also working there, in the I.L.O.?

A. Years ago.

Q. . . . I want to ask this. You told us a little earlier that you handled this \$10,000 transaction, and that you did not want to have anything more to do with the matter. The \$10,000 transaction was all over and done with on August 28th, when you had this last meeting with Koudriavtzev; and if you did not want to have anything further to do with Mr. Koudriavtzev, why did you arrange with him on August 28th to meet him on McTavish Street on September 28th?

A. There is one thing; I don't remember dates. The last time I saw him I gave him this information on the I.L.O., and after that I didn't see him any more.

Q. I did not ask you that at all. I suppose we will have to go through all this again. You just got through telling us that at your last interview with Koudriavtzev you made an arrangement to meet him on September 28th. Is your answer still the same, that you did make that arrangement, or do you want to change that?

A. No, I don't want to change it.

Q. All right, then; you did make that arrangement to meet him on the street, on McTavish Street, on September 28th, at nine p.m.?

A. He suggested that.

Q. And you agreed to it?

A. Maybe.

- Q. That is what I am asking you, and I thought you just got through saying you did agree to that. Did you, or did you not?
- A. Yes, I did.
- Q. All right. Then will you go back and pay attention to the question I asked you a few minutes ago? If, as you say, you did not want to have anything further to do with this business, and the \$10,000 transaction was all over and done with, what were you proposing to meet Mr. Koudriavtzev on the street in Montreal on September 28th for?
- A. I just said that I don't remember was it that time that I promised him to give the information on the I.L.O. and then I met him once more. If it was after that when I made the arrangement I changed my mind afterwards, but I didn't see him after the meeting when I gave him the information on the I.L.O.
- Q. But I put the question to you in this form. You made an arrangement to meet him on McTavish Street in the month of September, and for what purpose was that meeting; to discuss what?
- A. I don't know. I don't remember.
- Q. And you made up your mind in the meantime not to go, and you did not go?
- A. I didn't see him again.
- Q. The task about the characteristics of the institution, of the I.L.O., was given to you previously, at the meeting previous to the one of August 28th, as you can see?
- A. Yes, I see.
- Q. So you must have given the characteristics on the occasion of the meeting of August 28th?
- A. Yes; so that was the last talk.
- Q. But when you had that meeting on August 28th, 1944, you agreed to meet him again?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And the meeting was set for September 28th?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And you promised you would give him any other information he would like to have?
- A. No, I didn't promise anything.
- Q. Didn't promise that?
- A. No.